

ECFS - Email Filing

<PROCEEDING>96-45

<DATE>02/08/2005

<NAME>

<ADDRESS1>

<ADDRESS2>

<CITY>

<STATE>

<ZIP>

<LAW-FIRM>

<ATTORNEY>

<FILE-NUMBER>

<DOCUMENT-TYPE> RC

<PHONE-NUMBER>

<DESCRIPTION>

<CONTACT-EMAIL>

<TEXT>I do not want to pay more for my telephone service! I already am charged several vaguely described charges on my home phone. I have had to cancel all services except basic, and the basic is too expensive for a senior citizen living on a fixed,(low) income. I chose the Trakphone for the reason that I can buy only minutes I will need for emergencies. I find even it difficult to afford most months.

I urge you to reject a flat fee proposal that would change how contributions are made to the Universal Service Fund. I know that this proposal could make my current service unaffordable.

Under the flat fee proposal you are considering, people who make few long distance calls would pay the same as people or businesses that make many calls. In other words, low-volume and primarily residential customers would bear the same universal service fund burden as a high-volume residential or business customers. This is not fair!

I use my wireless phone for safety, and security. Like many seniors, my health is not good and I need to be able to have a phone that will be available and affordable if I need to call an ambulance. Otherwise, the phone is rarely used, because I conserve my minutes for this purpose. I still do not understand why the USF needs to be added to every phone service I have, the basic, the occasional long distance service I use and now my cell phone. I urge you to reject the proposal to move the USF collection system to a flat-fee.

Sincerely,

Bev Elliott  
8069 W Camas st  
Boise, Idaho 83709